

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-25, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the following discussion.

### **I. The Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Emery et al. (U.S. Patent 5,727,057) in view of Glorikian (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,317) and further in view of Brunts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,964,821).

#### **A. The Prior Art Rejection Based on Emery in View of Glorikian and Brunts**

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed sorting structure/method that presents personal user information to the user in a shortest-distance-first order based upon the current geographic location of the user. To the contrary, with the prior art of record only publicly available databases are related to location information, and such systems cannot related the user's personal information to the user's current location as the claimed invention does.

With the claimed invention, personal user information (personal telephone directories, to-do lists, e-mail lists, contact lists etc.) are maintained within a client wireless component, and added and edited by the user of the client wireless component. The client wireless component can determine its own location through accessing GPS signals or accessing other information such as local telephone area code information and can sort and display to the user the personal user information in a shortest-distance-first order. This allows the user to browse their personal information in an order that is relevant to the user's current position.

Emery is concerned with combining ubiquitous telephone identifications with ubiquitous location identifications into a telephone reference identification, and placing such telephone

references into a telephone network in a dynamic fashion. In other words, Emery helps match up location information with telephone numbers (col. 1, lines 27-32). However, such telephone numbers that are matched up in Emery are public directories of phone numbers and are not personal telephone directories. To the contrary, with the claimed invention, a user's personal information (such as to-do lists, personal telephone directory, etc.) is matched with location information to provide the user with a unique and personal sorting of information that is relevant to them alone. The telephone number location matching performed in Emery can only provide telephone information about large impersonal phone directories and cannot provide the user with the personalized sorted list of information provided by the claimed invention.

Glorikian similarly discloses the ability to display information contained within a public database (e.g., information of the Jamestown settlement in Virginia) depending upon location (col. 5, line 57-col. 6, line 14). However, again, such data is not personal to the user. To the contrary, with the claimed invention, a user's personal information (such as to-do lists, personal telephone directory, etc.) is matched with location information to provide the user with a unique and personal sorting of information that is relevant to them alone. The database location matching performed in Glorikian can only provide information about large impersonal databases and cannot provide the user with the personalized sorted list of information provided by the claimed invention.

Newly applied Brunts discloses a car-based navigation that sorts data from a public database according to the location of the car (Abstract). As with Glorikian and Emery the data that is sorted in Brunts is only maintained within a public and non-personal database. To the contrary, with the claimed invention, a user's personal information (such as to-do lists, personal telephone directory, etc.) is matched with location information to provide the user with a unique and personal sorting of information that is relevant to them alone. The point of interest matching performed in Brunts can only provide information about large impersonal databases and cannot provide the user with the personalized sorted list of information provided by the claimed invention.

Therefore, even if one ordinarily skilled in the art would have made the combination

09/769,452

proposed in the Office Action (which Applicant maintains would not have been made) none of the applied references teaches or suggests "sorting, within said CWC, said personal user information in a shortest-distance-first order based on said location of said CWC and said location identifiers; and displaying said personal user information in said shortest-distance-first order on said CWC" as defined by independent claims 1, 10, and 23, and similarly defined by independent claim 18 and Applicant submits that such claims are patentable.

Therefore, it is Applicant's position that independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 23 are patentable over the prior art of record. Dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-22, 24, and 25 are similarly patentable because they depend from allowable independent claims and because of the additional features they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney=s Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

6/22/07

/Frederick W. Gibb, III/

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frederick W. Gibb, III  
Reg. No. 37,629

Gibb & Rahman, LLC  
2568-A Riva Road  
Suite 304  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
(301) 261-8071  
Customer Number: 29154